

REMARKS

The present amendment to claim 1 included the limitations of original claim 29 and makes it clear that the substituents need to be selected so as to provide the desired wavelength. Applicants have not represented that all substituents and combinations of listed substituents will inherently provide the desired wavelength. It is an independent requirement. New claim 34 has been added corresponding to original claim 30, which had been canceled when allowability of the other claims had been indicated and has now been withdrawn.

The Examiner has imposed a provisional Double Patenting rejection over claims 1-23, 25-28, and 31-33 of US Serial No. 10/700,894, and a corresponding terminal disclaimer is enclosed to overcome that rejection.

Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested that the word “and” be inserted prior to the last compound listed in claim 28 and a period be placed at the end of claim 28. This amendment has been made. It is noted that in the previous amendment claim 28 had been revised to eliminate structures Inv-8 and Inv-12 because they were not within claim 1 structure. This had not been shown as deleted in the amendment so attention is drawn to that prior change.

Claims 1, 5-9, 13-23, 25-28, and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (JP04-335087). According to the Examiner:

Sato et al. discloses an organic electroluminescent element comprising a light-emitting hole injecting and transporting layer comprising a dopant naphthacene derivative according to formula (I) that comprises a substituent group such as an alkyl, aryl or aromatic ring that may be substituted (see Sato abstract). Although Sato et al. does not exemplify compounds with alkyl or non-aromatic carbocyclic groups according to the claimed formulas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected naphthacene derivatives with the substituent groups for the Sato et al. device according to the presently claimed compounds, because Sato et al. generally teaches all the required substituents for naphthacene derivatives according to the instant claims.

It is noted that all of Comparison Comp-1 through Comp-4 at page 39 of the specification appear to be within the teachings of Sato. Comp -1 of the present specification corresponds to Sato compound 1. According to the data in

Tables 1-3, beginning at page 39 of the specification , the substituents are not sufficient to provide a solution wavelength maximum such that $565\text{nm} < \lambda_{\text{max}} \leq 625\text{nm}$ and most of them are deficient in luminance efficiency. All four Comp compounds provide data thatsubstantiates the Examiner's supposition that all of the Sato compounds inherently exhibit the desired properties. By contrast, the compounds included within the invention exhibit the desired maximum absorption and are generally comparable or better in efficiency.

It is not believed that the present invention is obvious over the cited reference. Examples from among the reference's generic formula were unable to provide properties comparable to the compounds selected for the present invention. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejection in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.

Encl: Terminal Disclaimer